

Translation

Pat'd PCT/PTO 02 FEB 2005

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT/EP2003/007025



PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 2002DE122	FOR FURTHER ACTION See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)	
International application No. PCT/EP2003/007025	International filing date (day/month/year) 02 July 2003 (02.07.2003)	Priority date (day/month/year) 03 August 2002 (03.08.2002)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC C09B 67/22		
Applicant CLARIANT GMBH		

<p>1. This international preliminary examination report has been prepared by this International Preliminary Examining Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.</p> <p>2. This REPORT consists of a total of <u>5</u> sheets, including this cover sheet.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, i.e., sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications made before this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT).</p> <p>These annexes consist of a total of _____ sheets.</p>	
<p>3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <p>I <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Basis of the report</p> <p>II <input type="checkbox"/> Priority</p> <p>III <input type="checkbox"/> Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</p> <p>IV <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lack of unity of invention</p> <p>V <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</p> <p>VI <input type="checkbox"/> Certain documents cited</p> <p>VII <input type="checkbox"/> Certain defects in the international application</p> <p>VIII <input type="checkbox"/> Certain observations on the international application</p>	

Date of submission of the demand 11 February 2004 (11.02.2004)	Date of completion of this report 15 October 2004 (15.10.2004)
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/EP	Authorized officer
Facsimile No.	Telephone No.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/EP2003/007025

I. Basis of the report

1. With regard to the elements of the international application:*

- ☐ the international application as originally filed
- ☒ the description:
pages _____ 1-20 _____, as originally filed
pages _____, filed with the demand
pages _____, filed with the letter of _____
- ☒ the claims:
pages _____ 1-12 _____, as originally filed
pages _____, as amended (together with any statement under Article 19
pages _____, filed with the demand
pages _____, filed with the letter of _____
- ☐ the drawings:
pages _____, as originally filed
pages _____, filed with the demand
pages _____, filed with the letter of _____
- ☐ the sequence listing part of the description:
pages _____, as originally filed
pages _____, filed with the demand
pages _____, filed with the letter of _____

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rule 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the international preliminary examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in written form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages _____
- ☐ the claims, Nos. _____
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/fig _____

5. ☐ This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).**

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report since they do not contain amendments (Rule 70.16 and 70.17).

** Any replacement sheet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to this report.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/EP2003/007025

IV. Lack of unity of invention

1. In response to the invitation to restrict or pay additional fees the applicant has:

- ☐ restricted the claims.
- ☒ paid additional fees.
- ☐ paid additional fees under protest.
- ☐ neither restricted nor paid additional fees.

2. ☐ This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose, according to Rule 68.1, not to invite the applicant to restrict or pay additional fees.

3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is

- ☐ complied with.
- ☐ not complied with for the following reasons:

4. Consequently, the following parts of the international application were the subject of international preliminary examination in establishing this report:

- ☒ all parts.
- ☐ the parts relating to claims Nos. _____

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/EP 03/07025

V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	1-12	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1-12	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-12	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations

1). The closest prior art document is as follows:

- D1: DE 42 14 868 A (CIBA GEIGY AG) 12 November 1992
(1992-11-12)
- D2: EP-A-1 104 789 (CLARIANT GMBH) 6 June 2001 (2001-06-06)
- D3: EP-A-0 952 183 (CIBA SC HOLDING AG) 27 October 1999
(1999-10-27)
- D4: DE 101 06 147 A (CLARIANT GMBH) 14 August 2002
(2002-08-14)
- D5: WO 02/48269 A (BUGNON PHILIPPE; CIBA SC HOLDING AG
(CH)) 20 June 2002 (2002-06-20)
- D6: DE 40 37 556 A (CIBA GEIGY AG) 29 May 1991 (1991-05-29)
- D7: US-A-4 791 204 (IQBAL ABUL ET AL) 13 December 1988
(1988-12-13)
- D8: EP-A-0 243 304 (CIBA GEIGY AG) 28 October 1987
(1987-10-28)
- D9: PATENT ABSTRACTS OF JAPAN Vol. 015, No. 145 (C-0823), 12 April 1991 (1991-04-12) & JP 03 026767 A (TOYO INK MFG CO LTD) 5 February 1991 (1991-02-05).

2). The subject matter of the present application is novel over the cited documents (see the applicant's letter

of 8 September 2004).

3). Document D8 is the closest prior art since it describes pigment compositions also used for dyeing polymers.

The problem to be solved is understood to be that of providing further pigment compositions able to dye high-molecular weight materials.

Proceeding from document D2, a person skilled in the art would know that the pigment dispersing agent can have further substituents without this having an effect on its properties.

A person skilled in the art wishing to prepare further preparations would therefore modify the dispersing agent of the compositions according to document D8 and in this way arrive at the preparations according to the invention.

An inventive step is not recognized.

The applicant's argument is based only on document D1. However, document D1 is not the closest prior art document, and the argument consequently not convincing.

4). Industrial applicability is considered established.